

Knysna, about 250 km west of Port Elizabeth, must be the western limit for *U. africana*; experimental studies on the species in a heated pond adjacent to a power plant have been done here on a number of occasions (selected references are given in the application). Mossel Bay, about 100 km further west, is supposedly the eastern limit for *U. capensis*. Sakai's choice of a neotype for '*U. capensis*' from Knysna did not meet the locality requirement of Article 75d(5) of the Code.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Cliola (Hybopsis) topeka* Gilbert, 1884 (currently *Notropis topeka*) (Osteichthyes, Cypriniformes)**  
(Case 2808; see BZN 49: 268–270)

Hobart M. Smith

*Department of EPO Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0334, U.S.A.*

The case for the conservation of the specific name of *Notropis topeka* (Gilbert, 1884) for the Topeka shiner, as presented by Cross & Collins, is overwhelmingly convincing and has my full support. The attempt in 1989 to revive the specific name *tristis* Girard, 1857 for the taxon is another example of the unfortunately frequent disregard by specialists of the urgent need of non-specialists for nomenclatural stability.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Mugil curema* and *M. liza* Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1836 (Osteichthyes, Perciformes)**  
(Case 2834; see BZN 49: 271–275)

Ian J. Harrison

*Laboratoire d'Ichtyologie, Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, B-3080 Tervuren, Belgium*

1. In this contribution I designate lectotypes for the nominal species *Mugil curema*, *M. liza* and *M. petrosus*, all of Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes (1836). I support the application by Alvarez-Lajonchere, Trewavas & Howes.

2. Alvarez-Lajonchere and his co-authors gave good evidence that the type material of *Mugil brasiliensis* Spix in Spix & Agassiz, 1831 and *M. gaimardianus* Desmarest, 1831 is no longer available and that the original descriptions were unreliable. Therefore, I support the proposals to suppress these specific names and to conserve the names *M. curema* and *M. liza*, both of Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes (1836). However, the authors noted (para. 7 of the application) that *M. liza* is composite and there are also problems, which were not mentioned in paras. 6 and 7, with the syntypes of both *M. curema* and *M. petrosus* Valenciennes, 1836.

3. Alvarez-Lajonchere et al. (para. 7) referred to the four syntypes of *M. curema* in the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris (MNHN), listed by Blanc & Hureau (1971, p. 689): MNHN A.3653, collected by Choris from 'San Iago de Cuba' (the 19th century spelling of Santiago de Cuba); A.4641, collected from Maracaïbo by Plée; A.4655 and A.4671, collected from Martinique by Plée. Neither account, Blanc & Hureau (1971) and Alvarez-Lajonchere et al. (para. 7), mentioned material

from Brazil despite the fact that Valenciennes (1836, p. 88) stated that he had received *curema* from Bahia and referred to a specimen of 'neuf à dix pouces'. This specimen exists and is listed in the original registers (MNHN A.3638, from an unstated collector but perhaps Delalande since he collected other Brazilian mullets) as a syntype of *curema*. The specimen (240 mm standard length, 306 mm total length) generally conforms to Valenciennes's description of the species: it is moderately deep-bodied, the head is slightly deeper than broad, the second dorsal and anal fins are totally covered by scales, A III,9, the body is silvery-gold without longitudinal brown stripes and the caudal fin has a blackish distal margin. I count nine filamentous rays in the second dorsal fin of this specimen (Valenciennes stated I,9) and I count 37 scales between the operculum and the caudal fin base (Valenciennes stated 35 or 36 in longitudinal line). I do not regard these small meristic differences as significant. Since the specimen is in better condition than all the other syntypes I hereby designate it as the lectotype of *M. curema*.

4. I identify specimen MNHN A.4641 (noted above) as *M. hospes* Jordan & Culver, 1895. It has a rather slender body, a long, right pectoral fin (ca. 92% of head length), ca. 38–40 scales between the opercular opening and the base of the caudal fin, a rather thin upper lip, and I,14 pectoral rays (cf. I,16 (17?) in the lectotype and other paralectotypes of *curema*). The specimen is in very poor condition and could easily be mistaken for *curema*. It is marked as a syntype of *curema* in the register and card index of the MNHN but I am doubtful about its type status since Valenciennes's original description made no reference to material collected from Maracaïbo by Plée. Valenciennes (p. 88) referred to specimens of 'un pied et de quinze pouces dans les collections de M. Plée' but evidently these are the specimens from Martinique.

5. *M. petrosus* Valenciennes (1836, p. 89) has been cited as a synonym of *curema* by previous authors (see para. 6 of the application). The original description was very short, indicating that the species was similar to *curema* and referring to specimens from Brazil, Surinam, Gulf of Mexico, Cuba and New York. Brazilian material was not included in Blanc & Hureau's (1971) type catalogue and I cannot find reference to any in the registers and card indexes of the MNHN. In 1954–1955 a number of dry, badly preserved specimens were discarded and these included some Brazilian material (M.-L. Bauchot, pers. comm.) and possibly syntypes of *petrosus*. The extant syntypes represent more than one species. Two syntypes from Surinam (MNHN A.3611 collected by Leschenault; MNHN A.3612, collected by Levaillant) are *M. incilis* Hancock, 1830. Another two syntypes (MNHN A.3614, from Vera-Cruz, by an unstated collector; MNHN A.3615, from New York, collected by Milbert) are clearly *curema*. The latter species is common in warm, tropical and subtropical coastal waters of the Caribbean and Atlantic but has also been reported as far north as Cape Cod, Massachusetts (Jordan & Swain, 1884). This northerly range might be possible because of the presence of the warm Gulf Stream but, nevertheless, I have some reservations about the records from New York and Massachusetts. Milbert dispatched his material to Paris from New York but his collections were less precisely defined as coming from the coasts, rivers and lakes of that area (Bauchot, Daget & Bauchot, 1990, p. 109). Therefore, the reported locality of 'New York' for Milbert's syntype of *petrosus* should not be considered as exact and irrefutable.

6. I now designate the remaining syntype of *M. petrosus* as the lectotype of that nominal species. This is specimen MNHN A.3613, collected from Cuba by

Desmarest and referred to by Alvarez-Lajonchere et al. (para. 6). It is 117.9 mm standard length and 150.1 mm total length. This specimen is very similar to those of *curema* but it has a rather long pectoral fin (83% of head length) which almost reaches the level of the origin of the first dorsal fin, and the first dorsal is positioned closer to the base of the caudal fin than it is to the snout. Some authors have described or illustrated these features for the nominal species *M. gaimardianus* Desmarest, 1831 (for example, Jordan & Swain, 1884; Menezes, 1983, fig. 6) and Alvarez-Lajonchere et al. noted (para. 6) that the specimen might be the holotype. I agree with them that this cannot be proved. The morphometric features of the specimen can be interpreted as within intraspecific variation of *curema* and I agree with Alvarez-Lajonchere et al. (para. 6) that it is most likely this species. Designation of this Cuban specimen as the lectotype of *petrosus* renders the latter a junior subjective synonym of *curema* and thereby ensures nomenclatural stability.

7. In their search for the Cuban holotype of *M. gaimardianus* Desmarest, Alvarez-Lajonchere et al. (para. 6) stated 'there are no specimens from Cuba among the syntypes of *M. curema*'. This is incorrect; Valenciennes received a specimen of *curema* from Choris (MNHN A.3653; see para. 3 above) who collected in Cuba and the Antilles in 1827 (Bauchot, Daget & Bauchot, 1990). Desmarest might have used this specimen for his illustration of *gaimardianus* but again this cannot be proved.

8. Alvarez-Lajonchere et al. (para. 7) stated that the syntypes of *M. liza* Valenciennes include representatives of more than one species but they did not designate a lectotype. Valenciennes (1836, p. 84) referred to specimens from various localities but did not ascribe importance to any particular one. He stated that Delalande brought specimens from Brazil but this material was not included in Blanc & Hureau's (1971) type catalogue and I could not find it listed in the original registers or card indexes of the MNHN; presumably these specimens were either never incorporated into the collections (and Valenciennes himself did not see them) or they have been lost subsequently. Two of the extant syntypes (MNHN A.3668, collected from Surinam by Leschenault & Doumerc; A.6307, collected from Buenos Aires by d'Orbigny) are *M. cephalus* Linnaeus, 1758. The remaining syntypes (MNHN A.1050, A.4642, A.4656, A.4657, A.4659 and A.5763; see Blanc & Hureau, 1971, for details) have elongate bodies and 29–33 scales between the opercular opening and the base of the caudal fin. These more closely fit Valenciennes's original description of *liza*. They are all dry specimens and, while none is in exceptionally good condition, some are better preserved than others. The specimen that I select as lectotype is rather large but most of its morphological and meristic features are more clearly displayed than in several other specimens. This is MNHN A.4659, collected from Martinique by Plée, noted as a female on the baseplate and of 476 mm standard length and at least 566 mm total length (caudal fin damaged).

9. Valenciennes (1836, p. 84) mentioned that some of Plée's specimens of *liza* came from Puerto Rico. However, Blanc & Hureau (1971) made no reference to such material in their type catalogue. They incorrectly noted specimen MNHN A.5763 as from Martinique and overlooked the presence of an apparently original label placed securely in the specimen's mouth recording 'Porto-Rico'. The incorrect locality Martinique might have resulted from Plée's practice of collecting material from various localities and then dispatching it to Paris from Martinique (M.-L. Bauchot, pers. comm.).

10. Valenciennes's description of *liza* was short and some fin ray counts were inaccurate; for example, I find D2 to be 9, not I,8; P is I,15-17? (usually I,16), not 14. More complete descriptions were given by various other authors; see, for example, Jordan & Swain (1884), Thomson (1977), and Menezes (1983) who provided a detailed and accurate illustration (fig. 7) of the species.

### Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the practical assistance of the staff of the MNHN, particularly M.-L. Bauchot, G. Duhamel and J.-C. Hureau. G.J. Howes and J. Snoeks helpfully discussed the case. This work was conducted while the author was in receipt of a Council of the European Communities Science Programme bursary.

### Additional references

- Bauchot, M.-L., Daget, J. & Bauchot, R. 1990. L'ichtyologie en France au début du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle. L'Histoire naturelle des Poissons de Cuvier et Valenciennes. *Bulletin du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle*, (4)12A(1) supplément: 3-142.
- Blanc, M. & Hureau, J.-C. 1971. Catalogue critique des types de Poissons du Muséum national d'Histoire Naturelle. (Mugiliformes et Polynémiformes). *Bulletin du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle*, (3)15 : 673-734.

Comments on a proposed neotype for *Coelophysis bauri* (Cope, 1887) (Reptilia, Saurischia)  
(Case 2840; see BZN 49: 276-279)

(1) P.K. Tubbs

*Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

If this application is approved by the Commission the names of *Coelophysis bauri* and *Rioarribasaurus colberti* will be objective synonyms; as these are the type species of the nominal genera, *Coelophysis* and *Rioarribasaurus* will also be synonymous (para. 11 of the application). The mention of *Coelurus* instead of *Coelophysis* as the synonym of *Rioarribasaurus* in the last sentence of para. 10 was a typographical error in this office.

(2) Adrian P. Hunt

*Department of Geology, University of Colorado at Denver, Campus Box 172, PO Box 173364, Denver, Colorado 80217-3364, U.S.A.*

Spencer G. Lucas

*New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science, 1801 Mountain Road N.W., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104, U.S.A.*

1. We oppose the attempt by Colbert et al. to suppress the binomen *Rioarribasaurus colberti* by establishing a neotype for *Coelophysis bauri*.

2. Colbert (1947) assigned complete skeletons of Late Triassic dinosaurs from the Ghost Ranch dinosaur quarry in Rio Arriba County, New Mexico to the nominal